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*Abstract*

*With current considerations for reauthorization of the 2001 No Child Left*

*Behind Act, national attention remains focused upon public education*

*student outcomes. The purpose of this manuscript was threefold: to review*

*the historical background of the standards reform movement; to discuss*

*a research project to redesign program content and align standards in an*

*EC-12 Special Education certification preparation program; and to discuss*

*survey results concerning pre-service and experienced teacher perceptions*

*about standards and accountability. Results suggest that standards-based*

*accountability may be impacting teacher behavior with respect to student*

*learning. University preparation programs are aligning state, NCATE, and*

*professional association standards in teacher preparation programs. Both*

*pre-service and experienced teachers appear to comprehend the purpose and*

*implementation of standards within curriculum lesson planning and practice.*

*Further research appears warranted to follow up on the impact of standardsbased*

*accountability training on pre-service teachers after they have entered*

*the teaching profession. Further, empirical research appears warranted to*

*investigate full implementation of standards-based accountability in field*

*settings.*

**Introduction**

Standards-based accountability emerged as a major school reform agenda

during the 1 990s. The underlying consideration forming the philosophy for

policy was that educators would change their behavior as a result of federal

and state mandates focusing upon the requirements for establishing higher
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standards and greater accountability for student achievement (Cuban, 2 007;

Hoff & Manzo, 2 007). Currently, standards form the essential underlying

framework for teacher preparation programs. Teacher educators and public

school teachers hold pivotal positions in implementing standards in program

development, program implementation, and in program evaluation as well

(Byrd & Adamy, 2002; Selke & Alouf, 2004; Wise & Leibbrand, 2002).

With current public attention focused upon the 2 007 reauthorization of

the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), there have been suggestions about

increasing the rigor of state standards and testing by linking the state standards

to standards set at the national level (Olson, 2 007). A number of strategies

were offered for implementing state standards. Three appeared pertinent

for school district implementation. Instructional planning time was needed

for teachers to develop learning activities associated with state standards.

Benchmark testing was considered important to assess formative progress,

and professional development was considered necessary for both faculty and

staff (O’Shea, 2005).

This manuscript reviews the history of the standards-based reform

movement. A research study for the purpose of redesigning an early childhood

through 12 th grade special education teacher certification program demonstrated

standards alignment in teacher preparation. Additionally, survey results

identified current teacher candidate and public school teacher perceptions

concerning the implications of integrating the required state and local district

standards-based accountability policies.

**Literature Review**

***Teaching Standards: Historical Overview***

According to Gratz (2000), standards had two purposes. First, there

was the national concern that America was losing economic competitiveness

because of higher international student achievement levels, particularly in the

areas of science and mathematics. Second, there was national concern about

the growing student achievement gap between white middle and upper class

students and disadvantaged students. Consequently, state standards have been

developed to increase achievement level expectations for all students.

The history of standards began as early as 1 954 with the formulation of

the National Council for Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE). Early
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teacher accreditation standards focused upon process requirements such as

the number of students assigned to a laboratory school or upon completion of

state required forms. Although no student learning outcomes were required,

NCATE collected information describing teaching methods and strategies

used by student teachers (Wise & Leibbrand, 2002).

According to Wise and Leibbrand (2002), in the 1 970s NCATE focused

upon curricula for beginning and advanced teacher preparation. Professional

organizations provided subject matter content guidelines. Teacher evaluation

was required at the end of the preparation program and after entering the

teaching profession. However, no collaboration between teacher preparation

programs and the public schools was required (Wise & Leibbrand, 2002).

After 1 987, NCATE redesigned standards. Colleges of education were

required to show that their teacher preparation programs were based upon

current research and best practices. NCATE accredited institutions were

expected to use program standards from professional associations for content

and delivery methods. Diversity was addressed only for student and faculty

qualifications (NCATE, 1990).

In the 1 990s, NCATE standards for teacher preparation were strengthened

to align with the current focus upon achievement outcomes. In 1 993 NCATE

outlined a continuum that linked teacher preparation with professional

development requirements. In 1 995 NCATE shifted their focus to student

teacher candidate performance outcomes. This shift forced collaboration among

institutions of higher education, state departments of education standards

boards, and the teaching field. In 2000, NCATE ratified a performance-based

accreditation system and standards. Teacher candidates were now expected

to demonstrate mastery of both content knowledge and pedagogy (NCATE,

2001).

***Standards-Evaluation and Accountability***

Currently, the standards movement focuses upon evaluation and

accountability for institutions of higher education. NCATE requires universities

and colleges to implement a system for evaluation of teacher candidates at

entry, during their program, and again at exit. Benchmarks and evaluations

most clearly denote acceptable and unacceptable performance levels. Teacher

educators are expected to demonstrate a variety of teaching methods in addition

to lecture (Wise & Liebbrand, 2002).
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To further align teacher preparation accountability with student outcomes,

the 1 9 member Commission on Higher Education Reform has recommended

development of a student database. This database, to be known as a “unit

record,” would track individual student progress. It would allow comparisons

to be made among institutions of higher education teacher preparation

programs (Marklein, 2006).

Mixed reviews about implementing standards-based accountability have

surfaced. Authors have expressed concerns about the wide disparity found

among states in judging student proficiency. Cavanagh (2007) suggested that

states develop tests and set achievement levels based upon where the majority

of their students were likely to score rather than establishing higher goals for

all students. In contrast, Hoff (2007) reported that test scores were on the rise

in most states after researchers examined three years of data. While there was

no definitive connection to the current No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act,

Hoff and Manzo (2007) suggested that some individuals were beginning to

notice that educators were changing their behavior as a result of policies that

began in the 1 990s requiring higher standards and greater accountability in

education.

**Aligning Standards in Teacher Preparation: A Research Study**

An example of program redesign to align standards and obtain community

input follows.

***Purpose and Process for Research Project***

The purpose of this research was to redesign an EC-12 special education

teacher certification program. State, NCATE, and the Council of Exceptional

Children (CEC) standards were addressed. The process for this project

followed a research model and included the following components: instrument

development, respondents and data collection, data analysis and findings, and

program redesign.

***Instrument Development***

Content from three different university special education degree programs

for teacher preparation was reviewed and the core content was utilized to

develop a needs survey. A Likert-type scale was used to ask participants to
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rate each content item as (1) least important to (5) most important. A sample

of Part II of the survey may be found in the Appendix. Two open-ended

questions solicited participant concerns and recommendations for program

improvement.

***Respondents and Data Collection***

To ensure community participation, the local education service center

was asked to partner with the university and a senior faculty member from

the Department of Education Leadership served as the principal investigator.

Service center personnel disseminated the needs survey to all 32 districts in

their area. All of the 1 50 schools were invited to participate. Two hundred

twenty-three individuals responded. Most of the responses were received

from middle schools (49%). Twenty-four percent responded from elementary

schools and 1 5% from high schools. Over 41% of the respondents were

general education teachers, while 32 % were special education teachers. School

administrators comprised 2 7% of the respondents. Eighty-four percent of the

respondents were Caucasian females.

***Data Analysis***

A factor analysis was used to identify patterns of intercorrelations among

items to identify common strands (Kachigan, 1 986). The total amount of

variance was accounted for in five strands. A correlation analysis was used to

determine total instrument reliability as well as the reliability of each of the

five strands. Table 1 shows each of the specific strands with their associated

Cronbach’s alpha reliability quotient. Total instrument reliability was .92.

Strand 1 , titled Child Development/Classroom Management had a weak

reliability of .65. This may be explained by the varied content that was placed

together in this strand because it did not fit into other strands and the content

had to be included in the program. Strand 2 , Communication and Community,

also shows a very moderate reliability of .74. Similar to Strand 1 , content not

necessarily alike such as library and supplemental material was placed with

content focusing on direct communication and community content. All other

strands had higher reliabilities.

Survey findings were reported where responses clustered around common

themes, called strands. The strand rated most important by respondents was child

development and classroom management, while the strand with the least important
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Table 1 *Survey Instrument and Strands with Reliability*

Strands Reliability

Strand 1 – Child Development/Classroom Management

Content included: learning theories, child development, adolescent

development, integrating technology, classroom environment

and management, classroom assessment methods, discipline

theory and management, behavior management-special

education

.65

Strand 2 – Communication and Community

Content included: child guidance, parent communication, diversity

in contemporary families, library and supplemental material.

.74

Strand 3 – Special Education Applications

Content included: student teaching in special education, role

of special education teacher, instructional strategies

– special education, assessing learning disabilities

students – TAKS, assessing behavior disordered students

– TAKS, characteristics of mental retardation and severe

physical handicap, characteristics of learning disabilities,

characteristics of behavior disorder, transition – all levels,

low incidence disabilities – deaf, blind, multi, and autism,

implementing behavior plans, IEPS, and accommodations,

lesson planning for special education.

.86

Strand 4 – Content and Assessment

Content included: role of general education teacher with special

education students, early childhood content, reading, math,

science, social studies, PE/health, fine arts, music, art, tests

and measurements theory, statistical applications.

.88

Strand 5 – Legal Issues

Content included: state and federal special education mandates,

ethics concerning idea implementation, health and safety

issues in special education, confidentiality issues, and

FERPA.

.87

Total Instrument Reliability .92
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rating was communication and community. Forty-four districts responded to

the open-ended questions. Content areas deemed critical by special education

teachers were the need for special education candidates to have experiences at

a variety of campuses with different age groups and special education settings

before student teaching (34%). Twenty-seven percent of respondents stated

that university faculty needed more collaboration with site-based personnel,

particularly with principals and supervising teachers. In addition, 23 % stated

that special education candidates needed more hands-on experiences in

inclusion classrooms. Recommendations made by the respondents for program

improvement suggested more training for general education teachers in special

education areas (23%). Additionally, student teaching experiences needed to

be longer, at least one full semester (16%).

A focus group was held so that representatives from stakeholder groups

could discuss their recommendations for EC-12 special education preparation.

The focus group included sixteen participants representing special education

directors, principals, general education and special education teachers, an

educational diagnostician, and a counselor. Additionally, university professors

representing Pedagogy, Special Education, and Educational Leadership

preparation programs attended.

Focus group responses were unanimous among all 1 6 participants.

Emerging trends indicated a changing role for special education teachers.

Training issues supported the literature in that special education teachers

must be highly qualified through training, experience, and certification in

both content and pedagogy areas. Collaboration and relationships emerged as

components for success in today’s classrooms. Table 2 shows the questions used

for discussion and the responses provided by the focus group members.

***Program Redesign Standards Alignment***

A four member program development committee was appointed by the

Dean of the College of Education and Human Development. The charge given

to this committee was fourfold: 1 ) to review feedback from the survey and

focus group meeting; 2 ) to study EC-12 Special Education program standards

from the state as well as Praxis and Council for Exceptional children (CEC)

standards for all level special education; 3 ) to develop a matrix incorporating

NCATE, CEC, and state standards for current courses; and 4) to identify

gaps and design new courses needed. The program committee met on several
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Table 2 *Focus Group Questions and Summary of Results*

Question 1: What is the role of the mentor teachers during student teaching in field-based settings?

Results summary:

• School principals need more direction in selecting mentors.

• Major role of mentor is building trusting relationships.

• Mentor teachers need training on how to mentor.

• Need for current laws and strategies.

• More supervision from university faculty for both mentor and mentee.

Question 2: Are you familiar with the MAST training? Tell us what you see happening in

successful student teaching.

Results summary:

• A different kind of mentor training for teachers with alternative certification is needed.

• MAST training addresses issues of mentor training and should be implemented throughout all

field experience programs.

Question 3: Tell us about general education content areas necessary for special education teachers.

What would be the areas and levels of emphasis?

Results summary:

• General education teachers must have course work to deal with special needs students.

Special education teachers should have the most emphasis on low incidence and students with

behavior disorders.

• Reading, math, and classroom management is essential for all teachers.

• NCLB highly qualified requirements versus special education certification must be addressed.

• Special education teacher must have the ability to align IEPs with grade level Texas Essential

Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) through various instructional activities and be able to

communicate this to the general education teacher.

• General education teachers must recognize their responsibility for educating students with

disabilities.

Question 4: What special education experiences are critical for special education teachers?

Results summary:

• How to keep good data collection and documentation.

• Knowledge of various handicapping conditions and their characteristics.

• Knowledge of IEP meeting procedures and paperwork requirements.

• How to orchestrate multiple subjects/IEPs at same time.

• How to develop and follow BIPs with appropriate strategies and positive behavior supports.

• Awareness of legal mandates and issues.

• On-going formative assessment and how assessment drives instruction.

• Familiarity with research-based methodologies and practices.
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Table 2 (continued)

Question 5: What background is needed in tests and measurements for instructional support of

students in regular classrooms by special education teachers?

Results summary:

• How to interpret informal test data, documentation and other information.

• Writing useable assessment results that measure IEP progress.

• How to interpret interventions to determine if a special education referral is required.

• Know and utilize basic statistical terminology.

• Awareness of what data is available, how to interpret and use it, and to be able to disaggregate

data.

Question 6: What background is needed in legal issues and state/federal mandates for successful

Special Education Teachers?

Results summary:

• Need working knowledge of state/federal mandates and where to go to keep current.

• Have knowledge of due process, grievance procedures, parent rights, and mediation.

• Knowledge of student discipline procedures and issues.

• Knowledge of transition planning.

• Recognizing that the role of a special education teacher is changing to more collaborative with

general education teachers rather than only a content teacher. Must sell idea of inclusion and

accepts a change role.

• There is a need for practical experience throughout entire teacher preparation program.

occasions to complete this charge. Community feedback on program content

and field-based applications were incorporated. A matrix was developed

aligning state, NCATE, and professional standards (CEC) for course

requirements. See foundations course example provided in Table 3 . Content for

each of the newly redesigned courses was aligned with the required standards

and NCATE requirements. Course prerequisites were denoted. Examples of

content for two core courses may be found in Table 4.

An important part of the program redesign was to examine course

descriptions, expectations, assignments, instructional activities, and various

assessments contained in existing course syllabi. These previous course

syllabi were compared with the expectations of the newly designed program.

Pedagogy faculty familiar with and assigned to teach the special education

courses met to examine the content of the previous course syllabi. Based

on this examination, the newly designed course descriptions and standards

requirements were incorporated. The course syllabi were rewritten for the

*Journal of Educational Research & Policy Studies*

10

*Journal of Educational Research & Policy Studies*

0

Table

*Aligning Standards: Corresponding CEC Content Standards and State Content Standards (Example*

*Standard 1 only)*

CEC Standards State Standards SpEd

(EC- )

TExES Domains SPED ECCore

Course

. Foundations

 Philosophies: evidence-based principles and

theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and

historical points of view, historical and future

influence on special education and treatment of

individuals with ELN in school and society.

 Professional practice: assessment, instructional

planning, implementation, and program evaluation.

 Human diversity: impacts on families, cultures, and

schools; delivery of special education services.

 Relationships: Sp Ed organizations to organizations

and functions of schools, school systems, and other

agencies.

*Standard I.* The special

education teacher

understands and applies

knowledge of the

philosophical,

historical, and legal

foundations of special

education.

*Domain IV Foundations and*

*Professional Roles and*

*Responsibilities (estimate 20%*

*of test)*

*Standards Assessed:*

Special Education EC–

Standard I:

Special education teacher

understands and applies

knowledge of the

philosophical, historical, and

legal foundations of special

education.

Sp Ed

Foundations

4 Assessment

6 Role of the

Special

Educator

*Note.* Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core

Knowledge and Skills and appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge & Skills for which the program is preparing candidates.

*Source*. Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). ( 00 ). *What every special educator should know: Ethics, standards, and*

*guidelines for special educators, (5th ed.).* Arlington, VA: Author.

State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC). ( 00 ). *Special Education Standards.* Austin, TX: Author. Retrieved

September , 006, from the World Wide Web: http://sbec.state.tx.us/SBEConline/stantest/standards/allspeced.pdf.

State Board for Educator Certification ( 005). *TExES: Texas Examinations of Educator Standards: Preparation Manual*

*161 Special Education EC-12*. Austin, TX: Author. Retrieved September , 006, from the World Wide Web:

http://sbec.state.tx.us.
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11 Table 4

*Core Courses EC- 12 Special Education Certification (only two courses*

*shown)*

3372 Behavior Modification and

Classroom Management for the Student

with Exceptionalities

4308 Appraisal Processes in

Programming for the

Exceptional Learner

3 semester hours 3 semester hours

Course Description:

Principles of normal and abnormal child

and adolescent development; Nature

and causes of behavior problems. Basic

techniques for classroom discipline and

management; Principles of behavior

assessment and implementation of

Behavior Improvement Plans.

Course Description:

Formal and informal assessment types,

functions and legal implications.

Introduction to tests and measurement

techniques, data collection, and report

writing; interpretation to prescribe

appropriate curriculum modification,

instructional materials, teaching

strategies, classroom management,

functional behavior assessments, and

behavior improvement plans.

CEC Standards

2, 3, 7, 8

CEC Standards

1, 6, 7, 8, 9

State Standards:

IV, V, VI, VII, X

State Standards:

I, II, V, VII, VIII, X, IX

TExES Domains:

I, II , III, IV

TExES Domains:

I, II, III, IV

NCATE Assessments

Dispositions, Lesson Plan, Classroom

Management Plan, BIP/FBA

NCATE Assessments

Dispositions, FBA/BIP

Prerequisites:

Accepted Teacher Ed Program;

2.5 GPA, PEDG 2371, 3310

Prerequisites:

Accepted Teacher Ed Program;

2.5 GPA, PEDG 2371, 3310

*Note.* 18 hours core course content; 6 hours field based experience; 24 total hours.

Source: 1 Council for Exceptional Children (2003)

2 State Board of Educator Certification (2001)

3 State Board of Educator Certification (2005)
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new courses so that the syllabi now reflected the new course content, the

matching required standards, state examination requirements, and required

prerequisites and co-requisites. Degree plans for the special education programs

were redesigned to incorporate the new requirements for certification.

***Experienced Teacher Perceptions about Standards***

A teacher survey was designed to investigate teacher understanding of

standards. The survey was administered to seven public school teachers with

five or more years of experience. Survey questions were clustered into the

following categories for experienced teachers: knowledge and importance

of standards, lesson planning and instruction, accountability, benchmark

and teacher certification testing. Survey responses submitted by the seven

experienced teachers were analyzed using qualitative methods. Responses

were grouped with respect to respondent consensus.

***Knowledge and Importance of Standards***

All respondents expressed knowledge about the state (Texas) standards

and where to retrieve them on the state agency website. Some respondents

stated that use of the Texas standards was non-negotiable. Teacher respondents

stated that standards provided the framework for what students should

know and be able to do at various levels in each area of study. The teachers

acknowledged that additional standards had been developed by various

professional organizations but these standards were not considered as

important as the state standards. These teacher respondents considered the

Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) standards the most important

because these standards were incorporated into state student assessment for

accountability.

***Lesson Planning and Instruction***

The teacher respondents discussed a variety of ways to incorporate

standards into their lesson planning. Teacher suggestions included use of

commercial textbooks that now include a list of identified state standards

applicable for each content unit. Other participants reported using the Texas

Education Agency Webpage site for state standards lesson plan ideas. School

curriculum guides, scope and sequence charts and curriculum maps were

aligned with state standards. One teacher wrote: “These teaching standards
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13 determine the curriculum taught in my lessons. I follow the requirements set

forth in curriculum maps which are based on TEKS.”

***Accountability***

The teacher participants agreed that teachers are now held accountable

for student learning. Students must pass the state tests to graduate from high

school. School administrators review lesson plans to ensure alignment with

state standards. In some schools, administrators review teachers’ lesson plans

created on computer software specifically designed to incorporate appropriate

standards using TEKS curriculum guides.

***Benchmark and Teacher Certification Testing***

Teacher respondents were asked about benchmark testing during their

teaching preparation and about their certification test. One teacher responded,

“I do not recall because I tested for certification so long ago. However, I did

not study teaching standards and I passed!” Another respondent replied, “I

received my certification prior to certification testing; however, it does help to

assure quality control over academic departments.” The respondents agreed

that individuals preparing to become teachers should be keenly aware of all

standards required by governing authorities and state policy.

Teacher responses suggest an understanding of the use and importance

of standards within the teaching profession. Awareness of standards and state

policy concerning planning and instruction appears to have altered teacher

behavior. Teachers appear keenly aware of their responsibility for student

learning outcomes.

***Pre-Service Teacher Perceptions about Standards***

Twenty-two students enrolled in a post-baccalaureate course on

curriculum and instruction methods were asked to respond to a survey. Survey

questions were clustered into four areas: understanding of the importance

of using standards, benchmark and certification testing during preparation

program, standards covered in lesson planning, and standards with respect to

accountability. Survey responses were analyzed using qualitative methods.

Responses were grouped around the major themes.
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***Understanding the Importance of Standards***

Pre-service students agreed that standards formed the framework for

curriculum content. One student stated that “standards provide uniformity. If a

student moves they are not behind.” Another student stated “without standards

we cannot consistently control quality and expectations in our profession.”

***Benchmark and Certification Testing***

The pre-service participants were at different levels in their preparation

program. Comments concerning evaluation during their training varied. One

student commented, “I have met every core standard for teaching in my content

area and in knowledge of pedagogy in the content area.” Another student

stated: “These assessments – benchmark testing – are not authentic and rarely

accurately measure knowledge.” Finally, one student acknowledged, “Tests

are part of our program. We must pass in order to get certified.”

***Lesson Planning and Accountability***

The pre-service teachers acknowledged an emphasis upon lesson

planning throughout their preparation program. One student stated, “We

make sure the lesson follows TEKS standards because they are the points of

importance.” Another student stated, “We must make sure that we meet the

learning needs of each student by planning a lesson that includes an activity,

a discussion, and ensuring that children learn the lesson in different ways.”

Concerning accountability, one student wrote, “Standards help teachers

ensure that they are accountable for all the material that needs to be taught.”

Another student commented that “If you have followed the standards then

the accountability of your teaching has been met.”

This small sample of pre-service teachers appeared to understand that

state standards formed the basis for content and that standards were important

in lesson planning. Diversity in children’s learning needs appeared to have

meaning for these pre-service students. These students appeared to accept

benchmark and TExES (state certification) testing as part of their program,

although there are always those who do not value testing as a learning

experience. As expected, these pre-service students have not gained deep

understanding of the concepts of standards-based accountability that may be

associated with years of teaching experience.
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**Summary and Conclusions**

The first NCATE teaching standards were initiated over a half century

ago. With the impetus of education reform policy making of the 1 990s that

focused upon student learning outcomes, standards have assumed a central

position in changing the behavior of educators. At the university teacher

preparation level, programs are being revisited to ensure the inclusion of

NCATE, state, and professional association standards. Accountability testing is

required to ensure content and pedagogy quality as well as program preparation

continuity. Both pre-service and experienced teacher participants documented

an awareness of the importance of standards in lesson planning and delivery.

Student diversity and differing learning needs are being recognized and

considered important by teachers as a result of implementing standards.

A negative side of the standards movement must be recognized. High

stakes testing associated with standards may limit content taught to content

tested, narrowing the depth and breadth of content area options because of

stringent state standards associated with them. Additionally, professional

development content must be encouraged to address trends and issues beyond

local and state standards if teachers are going to be prepared to practice in

today’s global society.

At the present time the NCLB Act is being considered for reauthorization.

Persistent challenges in raising student test scores, raising graduation rates,

and school funding issues continue to focus public attention upon the nation’s

schools. Standards-based accountability appears to have the potential to

change the content and practice of teaching, as P-12 education merges into

P-16 and more university programs come under the scrutiny of high stakes

testing associated with standards.

Based on the limited sample in this study, further research is warranted

to examine pre-service teacher effectiveness after entry into the teaching

profession. An empirical study of experienced teacher behavior to examine

the impact of standards upon teacher leadership for learning also appears

warranted. This research may also have implications for P-16 teaching

applications.
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**Appendix**

Survey Instrument

Participant ratings of the importance of content areas needed to become an effective special

education teacher in today’s public schools.

Directions: Rate each statement based upon its importance for the success of special

education teachers. Rate **1** as least important; **5** most important. Indicate your rating by circling

**one** appropriate rating number for each item.

Item Importance

least most

. Learning Theories **1 2 3 4 5**

. Child Development **1 2 3 4 5**

. Adolescent Development **1 2 3 4 5**

4. Integrating Technology **1 2 3 4 5**

5. Classroom Environment/Management **1 2 3 4 5**

6. Classroom Assessment Methods **1 2 3 4 5**

7. Discipline Theory and Management **1 2 3 4 5**

8. Student Teaching Students with Disabilities **1 2 3 4 5**

9. Roles of Special Education Teacher **1 2 3 4 5**

0. Role of General Education Teacher-Students w/Disabilities **1 2 3 4 5**

. Behavior Management Strategies-Students w/Disabilities **1 2 3 4 5**

. Inst. Strategies for Students w/Disabilities **1 2 3 4 5**

. Assessment of Students w/Learning Disabilities & TAKS **1 2 3 4 5**

4. Assessment of Students w/Behavior Disorders & TAKS **1 2 3 4 5**

5. Characteristics of Students w/Multiple Developmental disabilities

(MR and Severe and Profound Handicap) **1 2 3 4 5**

6. Characteristics of Students w/Learning Disabilities **1 2 3 4 5**

7. Characteristics of Students w/Behavior Disabilities **1 2 3 4 5**

8. Transition of Students w/Disabilities-Elementary to Middle

School, Middle School to H.S., H.S. to Adult Community **1 2 3 4 5**

9. Introduction to Learners with exceptionalities & low Incidence

Disabilities, Deaf-Blind, Autism, Multiple Handicaps **1 2 3 4 5**

0. Implementing Behavior Plans, IEPs & Accommodations **1 2 3 4 5**

. Lesson Planning for Students w/Disabilities **1 2 3 4 5**

. Early Childhood Content **1 2 3 4 5**

. Reading Content **1 2 3 4 5**

4. Science Content **1 2 3 4 5**

5. Mathematics Content **1 2 3 4 5**

6. Social Studies Content **1 2 3 4 5**

7. Physical Education/Health Content **1 2 3 4 5**

8. Fine Arts e.g. Music & Art **1 2 3 4 5**

9. Child Guidance/Parent Communication **1 2 3 4 5**

0. Diversity in Contemporary Families **1 2 3 4 5**

. Library and Supplementary Material **1 2 3 4 5**

. Tests and Measurement Theories Statistical Applications **1 2 3 4 5**

. State/Federal Mandates Concerning Students with disabilities **1 2 3 4 5**

4. Ethics Concerning Implementing IDEA **1 2 3 4 5**

5. Health & Safety Issues Concerning Students w/Disabilities **1 2 3 4 5**

6. Confidentiality Issues and FERPA **1 2 3 4 5**
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37. List any additional content areas you feel are needed for the success of Special Education

teachers:

**PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT**

Directions: We invite participant input for improving our special Education Teacher Preparation

Program. Please list any recommendations that you have. In particular, please address student teaching

and university faculty collaboration and communication with field-based school.

Thank you for your assistance in completing this needs survey.